



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,858	11/12/2003	Kyeong-Hyeon Kim	8071-44 (OPP 030409US)	6701
22150	7590	11/01/2005		EXAMINER
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			NGUYEN, THANH NHAN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,858	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	(Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 and 32-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 32-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment dated 8/19/2005.
2. Claims 1-12 & 32-42 are pending for the examination; claims 13-31 are cancelled.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. The rejections are respectfully maintained and reproduced infra for applicants' convenience.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2, 6, 11-12, 32-33, 37 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lyu et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0149733.

Referring to claim 1, Lyu et al discloses a liquid crystal display device, comprising: first (1) and second (2) panels facing each other; a compensation film (41) and a first polarizer (10) disposed on the first panel, the compensation film having phase retardation characteristics; and a second polarizer (11) having a supporting film (30) disposed on the second panel, the supporting film having phase retardation characteristics, [see figs. 2 & 20].

Referring to claim 2, Lyu et al discloses a liquid crystal layer (100) for housing liquid crystals disposed between the first and the second panels, [see fig. 2].

Referring to claim 6, Lyu et al discloses the liquid crystals are aligned in a vertical alignment mode, [see fig. 1A].

Referring to claim 11, Lyu et al discloses the compensation film is a thin film having different values for Nx, Ny, and Nz wherein Nx denotes the refractive index in the direction of major axis, Ny denotes the refractive index in the direction of minor axis, and Nz denotes the refractive index in the direction perpendicular to the major and minor axis, [see par. 0089].

Referring to claim 12, Lyu et al discloses a liquid crystal display device, comprising: first (1) and second (2) panels facing each other; and a first polarizer (10) having a first supporting film (31) disposed on the first panel and a second polarizer (11) having a second supporting film (30) disposed on the second panel, wherein the supporting films disposed on the first panel and the second panel have phase retardation characteristics, [see figs. 2 & 20].

Claim 32 is met the discussion regarding claim 1 rejection above.

Claim 33 is met the discussion regarding claim 2 rejection above.

Claim 37 is met the discussion regarding claim 6 rejection above.

Claim 42 is met the discussion regarding claim 11 rejection above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 5, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyu et al in view of Kuzuhara et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0156235, and further in view of Ito U.S Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0001175.

Referring to claim 3, Lyu et al discloses the first polarizer (10) includes a first supporting film (31), [see fig. 20].

However, Lyu et al lacks disclosure of the phase retardation of the first supporting film combined with the compensation film ranges about 130 nm to about 160 nm in the vertical direction.

Kuzuhara et al discloses a film with optical biaxiality having a retardation in plane of from 31-120 nm, and a retardation in the thickness direction of from 60-300, [see Abstract], for the benefit of providing wide viewing angle, [see par. 0012].

Ito discloses a film with retardation values in the in-plane direction of 0-20 nm, and the retardation values in the thickness direction of 30-70 nm, [see abstract], for the benefit of preventing the framewise light leakage when used in a large liquid crystal display panel, [see par. 0008].

From Kuzuhara et al and Ito references, it is possible to obtain the retardation values in the vertical direction by combining the phase retardation of the compensation film with the phase retardation of the first supporting film in the ranges of 90-370 nm. The ranges of the phase retardation of the first supporting film combined with the compensation film in the vertical direction in application are within the ranges of the phase retardation of the first supporting film combined with the compensation film in the vertical direction of the references, and therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the phase retardation of the first supporting film combined with the compensation film ranges about 130 nm to about 160 nm in the vertical direction for the benefit of providing wide

viewing angle, and preventing the framewise light leakage when used in a large liquid crystal display panel.

Referring to claim 5, Lyu et al lacks disclosure the phase retardation of the compensation film ranges about 40 nm to about 60 nm in the horizontal direction and about 80 nm to about 100 nm in the vertical direction.

Kuzuhara et al discloses a film with optical biaxiality having a retardation in plane of from 31-120 nm, and a retardation in the thickness direction of from 60-300, [see Abstract], for the benefit of providing wide viewing angle, [see par. 0012]. The ranges of the retardation values in the horizontal direction and in the vertical direction of the compensation film in application are within the ranges of the retardation values in the horizontal direction and in the vertical direction of the optical biaxial film in reference respectively, and therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the phase retardation of the compensation film ranges about 40 nm to about 60 nm in the horizontal direction and about 80 nm to about 100 nm in the vertical direction for the benefit of providing wide viewing angle in liquid crystal display.

Lyu et al also lacks disclosure of the phase retardation of the first supporting film ranges about 0 nm to about 5 nm in the horizontal direction and about 50 nm to about 60 nm in the vertical direction.

Ito discloses a film with retardation values in the in-plane direction of 0-20 nm, and the retardation values in the thickness direction of 30-70 nm, [see abstract], for the benefit of preventing the framewise light leakage when used in a large liquid crystal

Art Unit: 2871

display panel, [see par. 0008]. Again, the ranges of the retardation values in the horizontal direction and in the vertical direction of the first supporting film in application are in the ranges of the retardation values in the horizontal direction and in the vertical direction of the film in reference respectively, and therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the phase retardation of the first supporting film ranges about 0 nm to about 5 nm in the horizontal direction and about 50 nm to about 60 nm in the vertical direction for the benefit of preventing the framewise light leakage when used in a large liquid crystal display panel.

Claim 34 is met the discussion regarding claim 3 rejection above.

Claim 36 is met the discussion regarding claim 5 rejection above.

Claims 4 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyu et al in view of Shibue et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0180149.

Referring to claim 4, Lyu et al lacks disclosure of the phase retardation of the supporting film of the second polarizer ranges about 0 nm to about 5 nm in the horizontal direction and about 100 nm to about 140 nm in the vertical direction.

Shibue et al discloses an optical film wherein the retardation value in thickness direction of 60-300nm, [see par. 0019], and the retardation value in the in-plane direction is no more than 10 nm, [see par. 0023], for the benefit of minimizing problems due to abnormal light emission, and exhibiting high performance optical anisotropy, [see par. 0016]. The ranges of the retardation values in vertical direction and in the horizontal

Art Unit: 2871

direction of the supporting film in the application are within the ranges of the retardation values in the vertical direction and in the horizontal direction of the optical film in the reference respectively, and therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the phase retardation of the supporting film of the second polarizer ranges about 0 nm to about 5 nm in the horizontal direction and about 100 nm to about 140 nm in the vertical direction for the benefit of minimizing problems due to abnormal light emission, and exhibiting high performance optical anisotropy.

Claim 35 is met the discussion regarding claim 4 rejection above.

Claims 7-10, and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyu et al in view of Kitagawa et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0140882.

Referring to claims 7 and 8, even though Lyu et al lacks disclosure of the polarizers include a polarizing medium made of polyvinyl alcohol (PVA), and the supporting films are made of triacetate cellulose (TAC) or cellulous acetate propionate (CAP). It was conventional at the time to have polarizing medium made of polyvinyl alcohol, and the supporting films are made of triacetate cellulose, as evidenced by Kitagawa et al, [see par. 0004], and therefore had the benefits associated with being conventional, such as the benefit of being available and the benefit of being suitable for the intended purpose. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the polarizers include a polarizing medium made of polyvinyl alcohol (PVA), and the supporting films are made

Art Unit: 2871

of triacetate cellulose (TAC) or cellulous acetate propionate (CAP) for the benefit of being available and being suitable for the intended purpose.

Referring to claims 9 and 10, Lyu et al discloses an elongation direction for the polarizing medium having zero value of phase retardation in the horizontal direction is the same direction with an absorption axis of the polarizer disposed on the first panel, and the compensation film is laminated perpendicular to the elongation direction of the polarizing medium, [see fig. 20].

Claims 38-41 are met the discussion regarding claims 7-10 rejection above respectively.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/19/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argument: In the Remarks, pages 7 & 8, "Lyu does not discloses, e.g., "a polarizer comprising a supporting film having phase retardation characteristics"... Moreover, Examiner's interpretation of element (30) as being a supporting film is misplaced. In contrast, Lyu discloses that element (30) is a compensation film."

Examiner's response: Even though Lyu does disclose the element (30) is a compensation film, element (30) still fits as a supporting film, which has phase retardation characteristics as claimed. The name of the element does not make the difference. Only the structure or the function of the element counts.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F/9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

Art Unit: 2871

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

(Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2871

-- October 28, 2005 --

TN

Andrew Schechter
ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER